

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated January 26, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 7-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious in view of DuBois (U.S. Patent No. 4,967,322) and rejected claims 11-12 as being obvious in view of DuBois in further view of Billingsley et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,110,558). Claim 7 is amended and claim 11 is canceled. As a result, claims 7-10 and 12 remain pending in the present application and are presented in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks for reconsideration.

As mentioned above, the Examiner rejected claims 7-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious in view of DuBois. Applicants have amended claim 7 to further recite "wherein said cylindrical main body further comprises a flat attaching portion having a first end and a second end, the first end being integrally formed on part of an outer side face of said cylindrical main body along a longitudinal direction of the cylindrical main body, the second end being formed to extend in a direction away from the cylindrical main body." No new matter has been introduced by this amendment and support for the recited flat attaching portion is apparent from at least Figs. 6 and 7, which show an exemplary attaching portion 28 having an end formed on the cylindrical main body and another end extending away from the cylindrical main body.

As a result, DuBois fails to disclose, teach or even suggest such an attaching portion having an integrally formed first end and a second end as recited in amended claim 7. Furthermore, the Examiner even admits that "DuBois does not require an attachment means on the outer surface of the sheath member" in the context of claim 11, which has been canceled.

Regarding an “attachment means”, the Examiner previously relied upon the disclosure of Billingsley et al. for the teaching that “the reflective article may be secured mechanically or by use of an adhesive to a substrate such as a fabric or article of clothing.” (citing col. 4, lines 3-6 and col. 7, line 30 – col. 8, line 3) Specifically, these cited portions of Billingsley et al. describe a binder layer 14 and the application of retroreflective appliques to a substrate by heat lamination, mechanical sewing, and using an adhesive layer. However, Billingsley et al. fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a flat attaching portion having a first end and a second end, where the first end is integrally formed on part of an outer side face of the cylindrical main body along a longitudinal direction of the cylindrical main body, and where the second end is formed to extend in a direction away from the cylindrical main body, as recited in amended claim 7. Thus, reliance upon Billingsley et al. does not cure the defect in DuBois in view of amended claim 7.

Accordingly, amended claim 7 is not obvious in view of the DuBois reference and, as a result, Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 7. Based on the same reasons and at least by virtue of their dependence upon amended claim 7, Applicants further request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of dependent claims 8-10 and 12.


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: April 26, 2005

By: 
F. Leslie Bessenger III
Reg. No. 39,108